arXiv:1107.4824v1 [cs.DS] 25 Jul 2011

Approximation Algorithms for Directed Width Parameters

Shiva Kintali[*] Nishad Kothari[†] Akash Kumar[‡]

Abstract

Treewidth of an undirected graph measures how close the graph is to being a tree. Several problems that are NP-hard on general graphs are solvable in polynomial time on graphs with bounded treewidth. Motivated by the success of treewidth, several directed analogues of treewidth have been introduced to measure the similarity of a directed graph to a directed acyclic graph (DAG). Directed treewidth, D-width, DAG-width, Kelly-width and directed pathwidth are some such parameters.

In this paper, we present the first approximation algorithms for all these five directed width parameters. For directed treewidth and D-width we achieve an approximation factor of $O(\sqrt{\log n})$. For DAG-width, Kelly-width and directed pathwidth we achieve an $O(\log^{\frac{3}{2}} n)$ approximation factor. Our algorithms are constructive, i.e., they construct the decompositions associated with these parameters. The width of these decompositions are within the above mentioned factor of the corresponding optimal width.

Keywords: approximation algorithms, arboreal decomposition, DAG-decomposition, D-decomposition, DAG-width, D-width, directed pathwidth, directed treewidth, Kelly width, Kelly decomposition, tree decomposition, treewidth, vertex separators.

1 Introduction

The notion of treewidth was introduced by Robertson and Seymour in their seminal work on graph minors [RS86]. Besides playing a crucial role in structural graph theory, treewidth also proved to be very useful in algorithmic graph theory. Roughly speaking, treewidth of an undirected graph measures how close the graph is to being a tree. Several problems that are NP-hard on general graphs are solvable in polynomial time (some even in linear time) on graphs with bounded treewidth. These problems include classical problems such as hamiltonian cycle, graph coloring, vertex cover, graph isomorphism and many more.

A graph G of treewidth at most k has a *tree-decomposition* $(T, \mathcal{X})$ of width k; that is, there is a tree T and $\mathcal{X} = (X_t : t \in V(T))$, a family of vertex sets (which are called *bags*), indexed by the vertices of T, with the following properties:

1. $\bigcup_{t \in T} X_t = V(G)$
2. for every edge $e = \{u, v\} \in G$ there exists a $t \in V(T)$ such that both u and v lie in X_t
3. for any $v \in V(G)$, if $v \in X_{t_1}$ and $v \in X_{t_2}$ then $v \in X_{t_3}$ for any t_3 on the (unique) path between t_1 and t_2

---

[*] School of Computer Science, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA-30332. Email : *kintali@cc.gatech.edu*
[†] School of Computer Science, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA-30332. Email : *nbkothari@gatech.edu*
[‡] School of Computer Science, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA-30332. Email : *akumar73@gatech.edu*

4. $\max_{t \in V(T)}\{|X_t|\} = k+1$.

This tree-like decomposition structure is exploited by several algorithms (often based on greedy approach or dynamic programming paradigm) to solve several intractable problems in polynomial time on graphs with bounded treewidth. Motivated by the success of treewidth, several directed analogues of treewidth have been introduced to measure the similarity of a directed graph to a directed acyclic graph (DAG). Directed treewidth, D-width, DAG-width and Kelly-width are some such notions. These directed width parameters have an associated decomposition structure, analogous to the above mentioned tree decomposition.

Johnson et al. [JRST01] introduced the first directed analogue of treewidth (called directed treewidth) and defined a directed tree-decomposition called arboreal decomposition. They demonstrated the algorithmic benefits of directed treewidth by providing efficient algorithms for NP-hard problems (such as Hamiltonian Cycle, linkage problem and many more) on graphs with bounded directed treewidth. The underlying structure in arboreal decomposition is a rooted directed tree (arborescence). Safari [Saf05] introduced D-decompositions and D-width, which is closely related to the directed treewidth. Here the underlying structure is an undirected tree. Berwanger et al. [BDHK06] and independently Obdrzalek [Obd06] introduced the DAG-width and the corresponding cops-and-robber game. They demonstrated the usefulness of DAG-width by showing that parity games can be solved in polynomial time on graphs of bounded DAG-width. This problem is open for graphs with bounded directed treewidth. Hunter and Kreutzer [HK08] introduced Kelly-width for digraphs. They also presented several equivalent characterizations of Kelly-width such as elimination ordering, partial k-DAGs and k-cop inert robber game. Both in DAG-width and Kelly-width the underlying structure of the associated decomposition is a directed acyclic graph (DAG). See Section 2 for definitions and more details of these decompositions.

Our Results: In this paper, we present the first approximation algorithms for Directed treewidth, D-width, DAG-width, Kelly-width and directed pathwidth. For directed treewidth and D-width we achieve an approximation factor of $O(\sqrt{\log n})$. For DAG-width, Kelly-width and directed pathwidth we achieve an $O(\log^{\frac{3}{2}} n)$ approximation factor. Our algorithms are constructive, i.e., they construct the decomposition associated with these parameters. The width of these decompositions are within the above mentioned factor of the corresponding optimal width. We make use of approximation algorithms of directed separators [LR99], [ACMM05] to construct the corresponding decomposition structures in a recursive manner.

Organization of this paper: In Section 2 we present the definitions of the above mentioned directed width parameters along with the required notations. In Section 3, we present an approximation algorithm for directed treewidth. This algorithm is based on a structural theorem (Theorem 3.3 from [JRST01]) of Johnson et al. In Section 4, we present an approximation algorithm for D-width. This algorithm is a natural generalization of the algorithm from [BGHK95]. In Section 5 we present our approximation algorithm for directed pathwidth. In Section 6, we define Kelly path decomposition and show that the algorithm from Section 5 implies approximation algorithms for DAG-width and Kelly-width.

2 Preliminaries

A digraph is denoted as $G(V, E)$ where $V = V(G)$ is the vertex set and $E = E(G)$ is the edge set of G. All graphs in this paper are simple, i.e., they do not have self loops and multi-edges. Some required definitions are in order.

2.1 Directed Tree-width

Johnson et al. [JRST01] introduced the notions of arboreal decomposition and treewidth for digraphs.

Definition 2.1. (Arborescence) An arborescence is defined as a directed graph R such that R has a vertex r_0, called the root of R, with the property that for every vertex $r \in V(R)$ there is a unique directed walk from r_0 to r. In other words, every arborescence arises from a tree by selecting a root, and directing all edges away from the root.

If $r, r' \in V(R)$, we write $r' > r$ if $r' \neq r$ and there exists a directed walk in R with initial vertex r and terminal vertex r'. If $e \in E(R)$ we write $r' > e$ if either $r' = r$ or $r' > r$, where r is the head of e. We write $e \sim r$ to mean that e is incident with r.

Definition 2.2. (Z-normal) *Let* G *be a digraph, and let* $Z \subseteq V(G)$*. A set* $S \subseteq V(G)$ *is* Z*-normal if there is no directed walk in* $G \backslash Z$ *with first and last vertex in* S *that uses a vertex of* $G \backslash (Z \cup S)$*.*

Proposition 2.3. Every Z-$normal$ set is the union of the vertex-sets of certain strong components of $G \backslash Z$. Equivalently, a set S is Z-$normal$ if and only if the vertex-sets of the strong components of $G \backslash Z$ can be numbered $S_1, S_2, ..., S_d$ in such a way that

- if $1 \leq i < j \leq d$, then no edge of G has head in S_i and tail in S_j, and
- either $S = \emptyset$, or $S = S_i \ \cup \ S_{i+1} \ \cup \ ... \ \cup \ S_j$ for some integers i, j with $1 \leq i \leq j \leq d$.

Definition 2.4. (Arboreal Decomposition and Directed Treewidth) *An arboreal decomposition of a digraph* G *is a triple* $\mathcal{A} = (R, X, W)$*, where* R *is an arborescence, and* $X = (X_e : e \in E(R))$ *and* $W = (W_r : r \in V(R))$ *satisfy the following :*

- $(W_r : r \in V(R))$ *is a partition of* $V(G)$*.* (DTW-1)
- $\bigcup\limits_{r \in V(R),\ r > e} W_r$ *is* X_e*-normal for all* $e \in E(R)$*.* (DTW-2)

The width of $\mathcal{A}$*, denoted by* $width(\mathcal{A})$*, is* $\max\{|W_r \cup \bigcup\limits_{e \sim r} X_e| : r \in V(R)\} - 1$*. The directed treewidth of* G*, denoted by* $dtw(G)$*, is* $\min\{width(\mathcal{A}) : \mathcal{A}$ *is an arboreal decomposition of G* $\}$*.*

2.2 D-width

Safari [Saf05] introduced the notions of D-decomposition and D-width for digraphs.

Definition 2.5. (Strongly Connected Set) *A subset* S *of vertices of a digraph* G *is called a strongly connected set if* $G[S]$*, the subgraph induced by* S *on* G*, is strongly connected.*

Definition 2.6. (D-decomposition and D-width) *A D-decomposition of a digraph* G *is a pair* $\mathcal{D} = (T, W)$*, where* T *is a tree, and* $W = (W_i : i \in V(T))$ *is a family of subsets of* $V(G)$ *such that all strongly connected sets* $S \subseteq V(G)$ *satisfy the following :*

- $\{i \in V(T) : W_i \cap S \neq \emptyset\} \neq \emptyset$*.* (DW-1)
- *subgraph* $(\{i \in V(T) : W_i \cap S \neq \emptyset\}, \{(i, j) \in V(T) \times V(T) : W_i \cap W_j \cap S \neq \emptyset\})$ *forms a connected subtree of* T*.* (DW-2)

The width of $\mathcal{D}$*, denoted by* $width(\mathcal{D})$*, is* $\max\{|W_i| : i \in V(T)\} - 1$*. The D-width of* G*, denoted by* $dw(G)$*, is* $\min\{width(\mathcal{D}) : \mathcal{D}$ *is a D-decomposition of* $G\}$*.*

2.3 DAG-width

DAG-decomposition and DAG-width for digraphs are introduced in [BDHK06], [Obd06] and [BDH$^+$09].

Definition 2.7. (Guarding) *Let G be a digraph. We say $W \subseteq V(G)$ guards $X \subseteq V(G)$ if $W \cap X = \emptyset$ and $\forall (u, v) \in E(G)$ with $u \in X$, we have $v \in X \cup W$.*

Definition 2.8. (DAG-decomposition and DAG-width) *A DAG-decomposition of a digraph G is a pair $\mathcal{D} = (D, \mathcal{X})$ where D is a DAG and $\mathcal{X} = (X_d)_{d \in V(D)}$ is a family of subsets of $V(G)$ such that*

- $\bigcup_{d \in V(D)} X_d = V$. (DGW-1)
- $\forall d \preceq_D d' \preceq_D d''$, $X_d \cap X_{d''} \subseteq X_{d'}$. (DGW-2)
- $\forall (d, d') \in E(D)$, $X_d \cap X'_d$ *guards* $X_{\succeq d'} \backslash X_d$, *where*

  $X_{\succeq d'}$ *stands for* $\displaystyle\bigcup_{d' \preceq_D d''} X_{d''}$.

  For any root d, $X_{\succeq d}$ is guarded by $\emptyset$. (DGW-3)

The width of $\mathcal{D}$, denoted by $width(\mathcal{D})$, is $\max\{|X_d| : d \in V(D)\}$. The DAG-width of G, denoted by $dgw(G)$, is $\min\{width(\mathcal{D}) : \mathcal{D}$ is a DAG-decomposition of $G\}$.

2.4 Kelly-width

Hunter and Kreutzer [HK08] introduced the notions of Kelly-decomposition and Kelly-width for digraphs. They also presented several equivalent characterizations of Kelly-width such as elimination ordering, partial k-DAGs and k-cop inert robber game.

Definition 2.9. (Kelly-decomposition and Kelly-width) *A Kelly-decomposition of a digraph G is a triple $\mathcal{K} := (D, (B_t)_{t \in V(D)}, (W_t)_{t \in V(D)})$ so that*

- *D is a DAG and $(B_t)_{t \in V(D)}$ partitions $V(G)$.* (KW-1)
- $\forall\, t \in V(D), W_t \subseteq V(G)$ *guards* $\mathcal{B}_t^{\downarrow} := \displaystyle\bigcup_{t' \succeq_D t} B_{t'}$. (KW-2)
- $\forall\, s \in V(D)\ \exists$ *a linear order on its children* $t_1, ..., t_p$ *so that* $\forall\, 1 \leq i \leq p, W_{t_i} \subseteq B_s \cup W_s \cup \displaystyle\bigcup_{j<i} \mathcal{B}_{t_j}^{\downarrow}$.

  Similarly, $\exists$ a linear order on the roots such that $W_{r_i} \subseteq \displaystyle\bigcup_{j<i} \mathcal{B}_{r_j}^{\downarrow}$. (KW-3)

The width of $\mathcal{K}$, denoted by $width(\mathcal{K})$, is $\max\{|B_t \cup W_t| : t \in V(D)\}$. The Kelly-width of G, denoted by $kw(G)$, is $\min\{width(\mathcal{K}) : \mathcal{K}$ is a Kelly-decomposition of $G\}$.

2.5 Directed pathwidth

Directed path decomposition and directed pathwidth were introduced by Reed, Seymour and Thomas.

Definition 2.10. (Directed path decomposition and Directed pathwidth) *A directed path-decomposition of a digraph G is a sequence of subsets of vertices $\mathcal{P} = X_1, X_2, ..., X_p \subseteq V(G)$ such that*

- $\bigcup_{i=1}^{k} X_i = V(G)$. (DPW-1)
- $\forall\, i < j < k$, $X_i \cap X_k \subseteq X_j$. (DPW-2)
- $\forall\, (u, v) \in E(G), \exists\, i, j$ *such that* $u \in X_i$ *and* $v \in X_j$, *where* $i \leq j$. (DPW-3)

The width of $\mathcal{P}$*, denoted by* $width(\mathcal{P})$*, is* $\max\{|X_i| : 1 \leq i \leq p\} - 1$*. The directed pathwidth of G, denoted by* $dpw(G)$*, is* $\min\{width(\mathcal{P}) : \mathcal{P}$ *is a directed path decomposition of* $G\}$*.*

A directed path decomposition $\mathcal{P} = X_1, X_2, ..., X_p$ may be viewed as a directed path with vertex set $\{v_1, v_2, ..., v_p\}$ and edge set $\{(v_i, v_{i+1}) : 1 \leq i < p\}$, along with a function $\phi : \{v_1, v_2, ..., v_p\} \rightarrow \{X_1, X_2, ..., X_p\}$ such that $\phi(v_i) = X_i$. This interpretation makes it easier to compare it with other width parameters. We will implicitly use this interpretation when necessary.

Henceforth, we use shorthand notations for all width parameters. For a digraph G, we denote its directed treewidth by $dtw(G)$, D-width by $dw(G)$, DAG-width by $dgw(G)$, Kelly-width by $kw(G)$, and directed path-width by $dpw(G)$.

2.6 Separator theorems for directed width parameters

Bodlaender et al. [BGHK95] show that treewidth on undirected graphs has a useful characterization in terms of balanced (undirected) vertex separators:

Lemma 2.11. (Bodlaender et al. [BGHK95]) *Let* $G(V, E)$ *be an undirected graph with treewidth at most* k*. Let* $W \subseteq V$*. Then there exists a* $\frac{1}{2}$*-(undirected) vertex separator of* W *in* G *of size at most* $k + 1$*.*

It is possible to extract similar characterizations of directed width parameters introduced earlier in terms of small balanced directed vertex separators.

Definition 2.12. (Directed vertex separator) *Let* $G(V, E)$ *be a digraph and* $W \subseteq V$ *be a set of vertices. Let* $\alpha \in (0, 1)$*. An* α*-balanced directed vertex separator of size* k *for* W *is a set* $S \subseteq V$ *with* $|S| \leq k$ *such that* $W \setminus S$ *can be partitioned into* W_1, W_2 *such that* $|W_1|, |W_2| \leq \alpha|W|$*, and there is no directed path from a vertex in* W_2 *to a vertex in* W_1 *in* $G \setminus S$*. We say that the directed separator number of a digraph* G *is* k *(denoted by* $dsn(G) = k$*) if every subset of* $V(G)$ *has an* α*-balanced directed vertex separator of size* k*.*

Henceforth, directed vertex separators will be referred to as vertex separators. The value of α will be specified wherever necessary.

Theorem 2.13. (Agarwal et al. [ACMM05], Leighton and Rao [LR99]) *There exists a polynomial time approximation algorithm that, given a digraph* $G(V, E)$ *and a set* $W \subseteq V$*, finds an* α*-balanced vertex separator* S *of* W *in* G *of size* $O(w \cdot f(n))$*, where* $n = |V|$ *and* w *is the minimum size of an* α'*-balanced separator of* W *in* G*. The constant* α' *depends only on* α*.* [1]

In the above theorem, Leighton and Rao [LR99] presented an algorithm with $f(n) = \log n$. Agarwal et al. [ACMM05], presented an SDP-based algorithm with $f(n) = \sqrt{\log n}$.

---

[1] In particular, $\alpha' = \frac{1}{2} \implies \alpha = \frac{2}{3}$, and $\alpha' = \frac{2}{3} \implies \alpha = \frac{3}{4}$.

2.6.1 Directed Treewidth

Theorem 2.14. (Johnson et al. [JRST01]) *Let G be a digraph, and let $w > 0$ be an integer. Then either G has directed treewidth at most $3w - 2$, or it has a haven of order w.*

Corollary 2.15. (Johnson et al. [JRST01]) *For every digraph $G(V, E)$ of directed treewidth w and $W \subseteq V$, there exists a $S \subseteq V$ with $|S| \leq w + 1$ vertices such that every strongly connected component of $G \setminus S$ contains at most $\frac{2|W|}{3}$ vertices from W. In other words, $dsn(G) - 1 \leq dtw(G)$, where $\alpha = \frac{2}{3}$ (refer Definition 2.12).*

Corollary 2.16. *There exist a constant $\beta \geq 1$ and a polynomial time algorithm that, given a digraph $G(V, E)$ and a set $W \subseteq V$, finds a $\frac{3}{4}$-balanced separator $S \subseteq V$ of W in G of size $\beta k {\cdot} f(n)$ where $n = |V|$ and k is the directed treewidth of G.*

Proof. Corollary 2.15 implies that there exists a $\frac{2}{3}$-vertex separator of W in G of size $k + 1$. The result follows by using the algorithm of Theorem 2.13, taking β to be enough larger than the constant hidden in the O of Theorem 2.13 to account for the factor $\frac{(k+1)}{k}$. $\square$

2.6.2 D-width

Theorem 2.17. *For every digraph $G(V, E)$ of D-width w and $W \subseteq V$, there exists a $S \subseteq V$ with $|S| \leq w+1$ vertices such that every strongly connected component of $G \setminus S$ contains at most $\frac{|W|}{2}$ vertices from W. In other words, $dsn(G) - 1 \leq dw(G)$, where $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ (refer Definition 2.12).*

Using Theorem 2.17 and Theorem 2.13, we get the following result, where the constant β is obtained analogous to Corollary 2.16.

Corollary 2.18. *There exist constant $\beta \geq 1$ and a polynomial time algorithm that, given a digraph $G = (V, E)$ and a set $W \subseteq V$, finds a $\frac{2}{3}$-balanced vertex separator $S \subseteq V$ of W in G of size $\beta {\cdot} f(n) {\cdot} k$ where $n = |V|$ and k is the D-width of G.*

2.6.3 DAG-width, Kelly-width and Directed Pathwidth

Lemma 2.19. (Berwanger et al. [BDH$^+$09]) *For a digraph G, if $dgw(G) \leq k$, then $dtw(G) \leq 3k + 1$, i.e., $dtw(G) \leq 3dgw(G) + 1$.*

Using Corollary 2.15, we have the following:

Corollary 2.20. *For a digraph G, $dsn(G) - 1 \leq 3dgw(G) + 1$, where $\alpha = \frac{2}{3}$ (refer Definition 2.12).*

Lemma 2.21. (Hunter and Kreutzer [HK08]) *For a digraph G, if $kw(G) \leq k$, then $dtw(G) \leq 6k - 2$, i.e., $dtw(G) \leq 6kw(G) - 2$.*

Using Corollary 2.15, we have the following:

Corollary 2.22. *For a digraph G, $dsn(G) - 1 \leq 6kw(G) - 2$, where $\alpha = \frac{2}{3}$ (refer Definition 2.12).*

Lemma 2.23. (Berwanger et al. [BDH$^+$09]) *For a digraph G, if $dpw(G) = k$, then $dgw(G) \leq k + 1$, i.e., $dgw(G) \leq dpw(G) + 1$.*

Using Corollary 2.20, we have the following:

Corollary 2.24. *For a digraph G, $dsn(G) \leq 3dpw(G) + 4$, where $\alpha = \frac{2}{3}$ (refer Definition 2.12).*

Using Corollary 2.24 and Theorem 2.13, we get the following result, where the constant β is obtained analogous to Corollary 2.16.

Corollary 2.25. *There exist constant $\beta \geq 1$ and a polynomial time algorithm that, given a digraph $G(V, E)$ and a set $W \subseteq V$, finds a $\frac{3}{4}$-balanced separator $S \subseteq V$ of W in G of size $\beta k \cdot f(n)$ where $n = |V|$ and k is the directed pathwidth of G.*

From Corollaries 2.20 and 2.22, we get corollaries analogous to the above for DAG-width and Kelly-width respectively.

3 Approximating Directed Tree-width

```
procedure makeArbDec($Y, W$)
    if $(4|Y| \leq 15|W|)$ then
        return an arboreal decomposition with one single node containing $Y$
    else
        Find a $\frac{3}{4}$-vertex separator $S'$ of $W$ in $G$.
        (Comment: $|V(C') \cap W| \leq \frac{3}{4} \cdot |W|$ for all strong components $C'$ of $G \setminus S'$
            using Theorem 2.13. Also, $|S'| \leq \beta \cdot k \cdot \sqrt{\log n}$).
        if $S' \cap Y = \emptyset$,
            pick an arbitrary vertex $v \in Y$, and let $S := S' \cup \{v\}$
        else
            let $S := S'$
        (Comment: Now, $\forall$ strong components $C'$ of $G \setminus S$, $|V(C') \cap W| \leq \frac{3}{4}|W|$
            and $|S| \leq 2 \cdot \beta \cdot k \cdot \sqrt{\log n}$)
        Let $G_1, G_2, ..., G_t$ be all digraphs such that $V(G_i) \subseteq Y$ and there exists
            a strong component $C_i$ of $G \setminus S$ (depending on $G_i$) such that
            $G_i$ is a strong component of $C_i \setminus W$.
        for $i \leftarrow 1$ to $t$ do
            Let $W_i \leftarrow S \cup (V(C_i) \cap W)$
            Let $Y_i \leftarrow V(G_i)$
            call makeArbDec($Y_i, W_i$) - we refer to this as the '$i^{th}$ call'
        end for
        return the following decomposition:
            Take a new root node $r_{Y,W}$ containing vertices $Y_{r_{Y,W}} = S \cap Y$
            For each $i$, add the arboreal decomposition $\mathcal{A}_i$ returned by the
                $i^{th}$ recursive call with a directed edge $e_{Y_i,W_i}$ from $r_{Y,W}$
                to the root of $\mathcal{A}_i$, and, assign the bag $W_i$ to the edge $e_{Y_i,W_i}$
    end if
end procedure
```

Lemma 3.1. *If Y and W are disjoint sets of vertices of digraph G, then* MakeArbDec(Y, W) *returns a certain arborescence $\mathcal{A}' = (R, X, W')$ with root r_0. Add the vertices in W to the bag associated with r_0 and call the new arborescence $\mathcal{A} = (R, X, W)$. Now, $\mathcal{A}$ is an arboreal decomposition of $G[Y \cup W]$. If*

$|W| \leq \beta k\sqrt{\log n}$, where $k = dtw(G)$ and $n = |V|$, then the width of this arboreal decomposition $\mathcal{A}$ is at most $\frac{19}{4}\beta k\sqrt{\log n}$.

Proof. Clearly, the algorithm returns some decomposition $\mathcal{A}' = (R, X, W')$ such that R is an arborescence. Now, we need to verify that $\mathcal{A} = (R, X, W)$ satisfies the two conditions stated in Defintion 2.4:

- To show that condition DTW-1 is satisfied, i.e., the bags associated with the vertices of the arborescence R form a partition of $Y \cup W$ into non-empty sets. Let G_j $(1 \leq j \leq t)$ be a strong component of $C_j \setminus W$ for some strong component C_j of $G \setminus S$. Hence, digraph G_j is strongly connected and $V(G_j) \cap W = \emptyset \implies$ either $V(G_j) \subseteq Y$ or $V(G_j) \cap Y = \emptyset$. However, the algorithm considers $G_1, G_2, ..., G_t$ such that $V(G_i) \subseteq Y$. Hence, $S \cap Y, V(G_1), V(G_2), ..., V(G_t)$ is a partition of Y into non-empty sets. By induction, $(W'_r : r \in V(R))$ forms a partition of Y. Now, by adding the vertices in W to the bag W_{r_0} associated with the root r_0, we obtain the decomposition $\mathcal{A} = (R, X, W)$. It follows that $(W_r : r \in V(R))$ forms a partition of $Y \cup W$ into non-empty sets.

- To show that condition DTW-2 is satisfied, i.e., for each i, the union of the bags associated with the vertices reachable from edge e_{Y_i,W_i} is W_i-$normal$. For this, we first need to show that $Y_i = V(G_i)$ is W_i-$normal$ for each $1 \leq i \leq t$. Using Proposition 2.3, it is sufficient to show that G_i is a strong component of $G \setminus W_i$. Following argument proves this: G_i is strongly connected and has no vertex in W_i. $\implies G_i$ is a subdigraph of a strong component H of $G \setminus W_i$. But $V(H) \cap S = \emptyset$. However, $V(H) \cap V(C_i) \neq \emptyset$ (since $V(G_i) \subseteq V(H)$). Hence, H is a subdigraph of C_i. But H has no vertex in $V(C_i) \cap W \implies H$ is a subdigraph of a strong component of $C_i \setminus W$. $\implies H = Y_i \implies G_i$ is a strong component of $G \setminus W_i$. By induction, and using the previous condition, it follows that the union of the bags associated with the vertices reachable from edge e_{Y_i,W_i} is W_i-$normal$.

Now, we show that the width of the arboreal decomposition $\mathcal{A}$ is at most $\frac{19}{4}\beta k\sqrt{\log n}$: By induction, it is sufficient to show that $|Y_{r_{Y,W}}| \leq 2\beta k\sqrt{\log n}$, and that $|S \cup (V(C_i) \cap W)| \leq \frac{11}{4}\beta k\sqrt{\log n}$. Now, $Y_{r_{Y,W}} = S \cap Y$. Hence, $|Y_{r_{Y,W}}| = |S \cap Y| \leq |S| \leq 2\beta k\sqrt{\log n}$ by Corollary 2.16. Also, $|V(C_i) \cap W| \leq \frac{3}{4}\cdot|W| = \frac{3}{4}\beta k\sqrt{\log n}$. Hence, $|S \cup (V(C_i) \cap W)| \leq |S| + |V(C_i) \cap W| \leq 2\beta k\sqrt{\log n} + \frac{3}{4}\beta k\sqrt{\log n} = \frac{11}{4}\beta k\sqrt{\log n}$. ☐

Theorem 3.2. *There exists a polynomial time algorithm that, given a digraph $G(V, E)$ with $|V| = n$, finds an arboreal decomposition $\mathcal{A}$ of G with width at most $O(k\cdot\sqrt{\log n})$, where k is the directed treewidth of G.*

4 Approximating D-width

```
procedure MakeDdec($Y, W$)
    if ($3\cdot|Y| \leq |W|$) then
        return a D-decomposition with one single node containing $Y \cup W$
    else
        Find a $\frac{2}{3}$-vertex separator $S_1$ of $W$ in $G[Y \cup W]$.
        Find a $\frac{2}{3}$-vertex separator $S_2$ of $Y \cup W$ in $G[Y \cup W]$.
        Let $G_1, G_2, ..., G_t$ be the strongly connected
            components of $G[Y \cup W \setminus (S_1 \cup S_2)]$.
        for $i \leftarrow 1$ to $t$ do
            Let $Y_i \leftarrow V(G_i) \cap Y$
            Let $W_i \leftarrow V(G_i) \cap W$
            call MakeDdec($Y_i, W_i \cup S_1 \cup S_2$)
        end for
        return the following decomposition:
            Take a new root node $r_{Y,W}$ containing vertices $W \cup S_1 \cup S_2$,
            then add all D-decompositions $\mathcal{D}_i$ $(1 \leq i \leq t)$ returned by
            recursive calls with an edge from $r_{Y,W}$ to the root of each $\mathcal{D}_i$.
    end if
end procedure
```

Lemma 4.1. *If Y and W are disjoint sets of vertices of digraph G, then* MakeDdec(Y, W) *returns a D-decomposition $\mathcal{D} = (T, W)$ of $G[Y \cup W]$ such that the root node of T contains all vertices in W. If $|W| \leq 6{\cdot}\beta{\cdot}k{\cdot}\sqrt{\log n}$, where $k = dw(G)$ and $n = |V|$, then the width of $\mathcal{D}$ is at most $8{\cdot}\beta{\cdot}k{\cdot}\sqrt{\log n}$.*

Proof. Clearly, the algorithm returns some decomposition $\mathcal{D} = (T, W)$ where T is a tree. Now, we need to verify that $\mathcal{D}$ satisfies the conditions stated in Definition 2.6:

- To show that condition DW-1 is satisfied, i.e., each vertex of G appears in some *bag* of the decomposition tree. We prove this by induction on the recursive structure of the MakeDdec procedure. This is clearly true when $3{\cdot}|Y| \leq |W|$. If $v \notin W_{r_{Y,W}}$, then this holds by induction, as v then belongs to exactly one set Y_i. Otherwise, $v \in W_{r_{Y,W}}$, and we are trivially done.

- To show that condition DW-2 is satisfied, i.e., the subgraph $(\{i \in V(T) : W_i \cap S \neq \emptyset\}, \{(i,j) \in V(T) \times V(T) : W_i \cap W_j \cap S \neq \emptyset\})$ forms a connected subtree of T. Again we proceed by induction. This is trivially true when $3{\cdot}|Y| \leq |W|$. Now, for a strongly connected set $S \subseteq Y \cup W$, if $W_{r_{Y,W}} \cap S = \emptyset$, then this holds true by induction since S is entirely contained in one of the subtrees, i.e., $S \subseteq Y_i$ for some i. Otherwise, for each of the subtrees T_i (corresponding to strongly connected component G_i) under $r_{Y,W}$, either S does not intersect with any of the *bags* in this subtree, or, the subgraph $(\{i \in V(T') : W_i \cap S \neq \emptyset\}, \{(i,j) \in V(T') \times V(T') : W_i \cap W_j \cap S \neq \emptyset\})$ forms a connected subtree of T. Moreover, in the latter case, this connected subtree includes the root r_i of this subtree, i.e., the child of $r_{Y,W}$ that is in this subtree. This is because $W_{r_{Y,W}} = W \cup S \cup S'$ and $W_i \subseteq W$, and by induction, r_i contains all vertices in $W_i \cup S \cup S'$. Further, by the same argument, it follows that r_i contains an element of S which also occurs in $W_{r_{Y,W}}$, i.e., $W_{r_{Y,W}} \cap W_i \neq \emptyset$. Hence, the result follows.

Now, we show that the width of the *D-decomposition* $\mathcal{D}$ is at most $8{\cdot}\beta{\cdot}k{\cdot}\sqrt{\log n}$. By induction, it is sufficient to show that $|W_{r_{Y,W}}| \leq 8{\cdot}\beta{\cdot}k{\cdot}\sqrt{\log n}$, and that $|W_i \cup S \cup S'| \leq 6{\cdot}\beta{\cdot}k{\cdot}\sqrt{\log n}$. The first inequality follows by using the assumption $|W| \leq 6{\cdot}\beta{\cdot}k{\cdot}\sqrt{\log n}$, and using Theorem 2.17 to bound the size of S_1 and S_2 each by $\beta{\cdot}k{\cdot}\sqrt{\log n}$. The second inequality follows because $S_1 \cup S_2$ is a $\frac{2}{3}$-separator of W in $G[Y \cup W]$ $\implies \forall$ i, $|W_i| \leq 4{\cdot}\beta{\cdot}k{\cdot}\sqrt{\log n} \implies |W_i \cup S \cup S'| \leq 6{\cdot}\beta{\cdot}k{\cdot}\sqrt{\log n}$. ☐

Theorem 4.2. *There exists a polynomial time algorithm that, given a digraph $G(V, E)$ with $|V| = n$, finds a D-decomposition $\mathcal{D}$ of G with width at most $O(k{\cdot}\sqrt{\log n})$, where k is the D-width of G.*

5 Approximating Directed Pathwidth

In this section, we present an algorithm that computes an approximate path decomposition (see Section 2.5) of a digraph G with width at most $O(\beta k \log^{3/2} n)$, where k is the directed pathwidth of G and β is the constant as given by Corollary 2.25. The algorithm MakeDPD is called with $W = V$. The 3-tuple (S, W_1, W_2) is a partition of V such that S is a $\frac{3}{4}$-balanced vertex separator of G (see Definition 2.12). The algorithm recursively computes the directed path decompositions $\mathcal{P}_{W_1}$ of $G[W_1]$ and $\mathcal{P}_{W_2}$ of $G[W_2]$. We obtain $\mathcal{P}'_{W_1}$ and $\mathcal{P}'_{W_2}$ by adding S into the bags corresponding to each node of $\mathcal{P}_{W_1}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{W_2}$ respectively. The path decomposition of G (say $\mathcal{P}$) is obtained by adding a directed edge from the sink node of $\mathcal{P}'_{W_1}$ to the source node of $\mathcal{P}'_{W_2}$. We denote this operation by $\mathcal{P}'_{W_1} \oplus \mathcal{P}'_{W_2}$. The algorithm stops when the size of the set W is less than $\beta \log^{3/2} n$.

```
procedure MakeDPD($W$)
    if ($|W| \leq \beta \log^{3/2} n$) then
        return the trivial path decomposition with one singe node containing $W$.
    else
        begin
            Find a $\frac{3}{4}$-directed vertex separator of $G[W]$ using Theorem 2.13.
            Let $(S, W_1, W_2)$ be the partition thus obtained (see Definition 2.12).
            Let $\mathcal{P}_{W_1} \leftarrow$ MakeDPD($W_1$)
            Let $\mathcal{P}_{W_2} \leftarrow$ MakeDPD($W_2$)
            Add $S$ to all the bags of $\mathcal{P}_{W_1}$ to get $\mathcal{P}'_{W_1}$
            Add $S$ to all the bags of $\mathcal{P}_{W_2}$ to get $\mathcal{P}'_{W_2}$
            $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \mathcal{P}'_{W_1} \oplus \mathcal{P}'_{W_2}$
            return $\mathcal{P}$
    end if
end procedure
```

Lemma 5.1. *Given a digraph $G(V, E)$,* MakeDPD(V) *returns a directed path decomposition $\mathcal{P}$ of G of width at most $2\beta k \log^{3/2} n$ where $n = |V|$ and k is the directed path width of G, where β is the constant as given by Corollary 2.25.*

Proof. It is easy to see that the directed path decomposition $\mathcal{P}$ returned by MakeDPD satisfies DPW-1. We prove using induction on the recursive structure of the algorithm. In case $|W| \leq \beta k \log^{3/2} n$, conditions DPW-2 and DPW-3 are trivially satisfied. Now, assume that $\mathcal{P}_{W_1}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{W_2}$ satisfy DPW-2 and DPW-3. We obtain $\mathcal{P}'_{W_1}$ and $\mathcal{P}'_{W_2}$ by adding S into the bags of all the nodes of $\mathcal{P}_{W_1}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{W_2}$ respectively. Hence the connectivity condition DPW-2 is satisfied for $\mathcal{P}'_{W_1}$ and $\mathcal{P}'_{W_2}$. We observe that we add a directed edge from the sink of $\mathcal{P}'_{W_1}$ to the source of $\mathcal{P}'_{W_2}$, and edges in $G[V \setminus S]$ (if any) go from W_1 to W_2 only. Hence, the condition DPW-3 is satisfied in $\mathcal{P}$ as well.

Now we prove the bound on the width of the directed path decomposition $\mathcal{P}$ returned by the above algorithm. This can be obtained by arguing about the maximum size of a bag in the path decomposition. Using Corollary 2.25, at each recursion step, $|S| \leq \beta k \sqrt{\log n}$ where k is the directed path width of G. Since each invocation of MakeDPD finds a *balanced* separator, the algorithm terminates after a recursion depth of $O(\log n)$. Hence, we add a maximum of $\gamma \cdot \log n$ separator sets (denoted by S) to any bag of $\mathcal{P}$ (for some constant γ). Further, the termination condition $|W| \leq \beta \log^{3/2} n$, ensures that the maximum bag size is $(\beta k \sqrt{\log n} \cdot \gamma \log n) + \beta \log^{3/2} n = \beta(\gamma k + 1) \log^{3/2} n$. Hence $width(\mathcal{P}) \leq 2\beta\gamma k \log^{3/2} n$. ☐

6 Approximating DAG-width and Kelly-width

6.1 Approximating DAG-width

Berwanger et al [BDH$^+$09] showed that DAG-width generalizes directed pathwidth. Let $\mathcal{P} = W_1, W_2, ..., W_p$ be a directed path decomposition of G of width k. Let D be a directed path with p vertices i.e., $V(D) = \{d_1, \ldots, d_p\}$ and $(d_i, d_j) \in E(D)$ if and only if $j = i + 1$. Set $X_{d_i} := W_i$ for all $d_i \in V(D)$. Berwanger et al [BDH$^+$09] proved that $\mathcal{D} = (D, (X_d)_{d \in V(D)})$ is a DAG-decomposition of G of width $k + 1$. Essentially they proved that if D is a directed path then (i) DGW-1 is equivalent to DPW-1, (ii) DGW-2 is equivalent to DPW-2 and (iii) DGW-3 is equivalent to DPW-2 and DPW-3.

Lemma 6.1. (Berwanger et al. [BDH$^+$09]) For a digraph G, a directed path decomposition of width k is essentially a DAG-decomposition of width $k + 1$. In other words, if $dpw(G) = k$, then $dgw(G) \leq k + 1$.

Corollary 6.2. *There exists a polynomial time algorithm that, given a digraph $G(V, E)$ with $|V| = n$, finds a DAG-decomposition $\mathcal{D} = (D, \mathcal{X})$ of G of width at most $O(k \cdot \log^{\frac{3}{2}} n)$, where k is the DAG-width of G.*

Proof. In Section 5, we presented an algorithm that finds an approximate path decomposition (say $\mathcal{P}$) of G. Using Lemma 6.1, $\mathcal{P}$ can be converted to a corresponding DAG-decomposition $\mathcal{D} = (D, \mathcal{X})$ such that $width(\mathcal{D}) = width(\mathcal{P}) + 1$ and the DAG D is a directed path. The approximation factor follows from the discussion at the end of Section 2.6. ☐

6.2 Approximating Kelly-width

In the previous subsection, we mentioned that DAG-width generalizes directed pathwidth. In other words, restricting the underlying DAG of the DAG
decomposition to be a directed path gives the corresponding directed path decomposition. We now define *Kelly path decomposition* by restricting the underlying DAG of the Kelly-decomposition to be a directed path.

Definition 6.3. (Kelly path decomposition and Kelly pathwidth) *A Kelly path decomposition of a digraph G is a sequence of pairs $\mathcal{KP} = (B_1, W_1), (B_2, W_2), ..., (B_p, W_p)$ where $B_i, W_i \subseteq V(G)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq p$, such that*

- $(B_i)_{1 \leq i \leq p}$ *partitions* $V(D)$. KPW-1
- $\forall\, 1 \leq i \leq p$, W_i *guards* $\bigcup_{j \geq i} B_j$. KPW-2
- $\forall\, 1 \leq i < p$, $W_{i+1} \subseteq B_i \cup W_i$. KPW-3

The width of $\mathcal{KP}$, denoted by $width(\mathcal{KP})$ is $\max\{|W_i \cup B_i| : 1 \leq i \leq p\}$. *The Kelly pathwidth of G, denoted as $kpw(G)$, is* $\min\{width(\mathcal{KP}) : \mathcal{KP}$ *is a*
Kelly path decomposition of G $\}$.

In a manner similar to directed path decomposition, one may view Kelly path decomposition $\mathcal{KP} = (B_1, W_1), (B_2, W_2), ..., (B_p, W_p)$ as a directed path with vertex set $\{u_1, u_2, ..., u_p\}$ and edge set $\{(u_i, u_{i+1}) : 1 \leq i < p\}$, along with a function $\psi : \{u_1, u_2, ..., u_p\} \to \{(B_1, W_1), (B_2, W_2), ..., (B_p, W_p)\}$ such that $\psi(u_i) = (B_i, W_i)$. We will use this interpretation implicitly.

Now we show that Kelly-width generalizes directed pathwidth in the same way that DAG-width does.

Lemma 6.4. For any digraph G, $kpw(G) - 1 = dpw(G)$.

Proof. First we show that $kpw(G) - 1 \leq dpw(G)$: Consider a directed path decomposition $\mathcal{P} = X_1$, X_2,..., X_p of digraph G. We may assume that $X_{i+1} \nsubseteq X_i$ for all $1 \leq i < p$. This assumption can be made because: say if for some i, $X_{i+1} \subseteq X_i$, we can remove X_{i+1} from $\mathcal{P}$ and still have a valid directed path decomposition i.e., DPW-1, DPW-2 and DPW-3 are still satisfied.

Now we construct the sequence $\mathcal{KP} = (B_1, W_1)$, (B_2, W_2), ..., (B_p, W_p), such that for all $1 \leq i \leq p$, $W_i = X_{i-1} \cap X_i$ and $B_i = X_i \setminus W_i$ and X_0 is defined to be $\emptyset$. We claim that $\mathcal{KP}$ is a valid Kelly path decomposition of G. To prove this, we verify that B_i's and W_i's satisfy all conditions stated in Definition 6.3:

- To show that KPW-1 holds true, i.e., $(B_i)_{1 \leq i \leq p}$ partitions $V(G)$.

  $$\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq p} B_i = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq p} (X_i \setminus (X_{i-1} \cap X_i)) = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq p} (X_i \setminus X_{i-1}) = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq p} X_i = V(G)$$

  Now, we verify: for all $v \in V(G)$, there exists a unique bag which contains v, i.e. there exists $1 \leq i \leq p$ such that $v \in B_i$ and $v \notin B_j$ for all $j \neq i$. Using DPW-1, there exists $1 \leq k \leq p$ such that $v \in X_k$. Let $v \in X_i$ such that $v \notin X_j$ for $j < i$. Hence, $v \notin X_{i-1} \implies v \in B_i$. Moreover, $v \notin B_j$ for all $j < i$. Further, for all $j > i$ such that $v \in X_j \implies v \in X_{j-1}$ (from DPW-2). Hence, $v \in X_j \cap X_{j-1} \implies v \notin B_j$. Hence, B_i is the *unique* bag which contains the vertex v. Hence, KPW-1 holds true.

- To show that KPW-2 holds true, i.e., $\forall\, 1 \leq i \leq p$, W_i guards $\bigcup_{j \geq i} B_j$.

  Since we know that a directed path decomposition satisfies all the conditions of a DAG-decomposition, it follows from DGW-3 that $X_{i-1} \cap X_i = W_i$ guards $(\bigcup_{j \geq i} X_j) \setminus X_{i-1}$. Observe that

  $$\bigcup_{j \geq i} X_j = X_i \cup (\bigcup_{j > i} (X_j \setminus (X_{j-1} \cap X_j))) = X_i \cup (\bigcup_{j > i} B_j)$$

  Also, $(\bigcup_{j \geq i} X_j) \setminus X_{i-1} = \bigcup_{j \geq i} B_j$ by definition of B_i. Hence, KPW-2 holds true.

- To show that KPW-3 holds true, i.e., $\forall\, 1 \leq i < p$, $W_{i+1} \subseteq B_i \cup W_i$.
  Observe that $B_i \cup W_i = (X_i \setminus W_i) \cup W_i = X_i$. Also, $W_{i+1} = X_i \cap X_{i+1} \subseteq X_i$. Hence, $W_{i+1} \subseteq B_i \cup W_i$. Hence, KPW-3 holds true.

Since $B_i \cup W_i = X_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq p$, $width(\mathcal{KP}) - 1 = width(\mathcal{P})$. This proves $kpw(G) - 1 \leq dpw(G)$.

Now we show that $dpw(G) \leq kpw(G) - 1$: Consider a Kelly path decomposition $\mathcal{KP} = (B_1, W_1)$, (B_2, W_2),..., (B_p, W_p) of digraph G. We claim that the following sequence is a valid directed path decomposition of G.

$$\mathcal{P} = X_1, X_2, ..., X_p, \text{ where, for all } 1 \leq i \leq p, X_i = B_i \cup W_i.$$

To see this, we verify that X_i's satisfy all conditions stated in Definition 2.5:

- To show that DPW-1 holds true, i.e., $\bigcup_{1\leq i\leq p} X_i = V(G)$.
  This follows easily since $(B_i)_{1\leq i\leq p}$ is a partition of $V(G)$ and for all $1 \leq i \leq p$, $B_i \subseteq X_i$.

- To show that DPW-2 holds true, i.e., $\forall\ i < j < k$, $X_i \cap X_k \subseteq X_j$. Now, $X_i \cap X_k = (B_i \cup W_i) \cap (B_k \cup W_k) = (B_i \cap B_k) \cup (B_i \cap W_k) \cup (W_i \cap B_k) \cup (W_i \cap W_k)$. We know that $(B_i \cap B_k) = \emptyset$ from KPW-1. Also, $W_i \cap B_k = \emptyset$ from KPW-2, and Definition 2.7. Thus, we only need to show that $(B_i \cup W_i) \cap W_k \subseteq B_j \cup W_j$ for all $i < j < k$.
  Using KPW-3 we have $W_k \subseteq B_{k-1} \cup W_{k-1}$. Now, let us consider a vertex $v \in (B_i \cup W_i) \cap W_k$. Since $B_i \cap W_i = \emptyset$ by KPW-2, either $v \in B_i$, or $v \in W_i$. If $v \in B_i$, then $v \notin B_{k-1} \implies v \in W_{k-1}$. Hence, $v \in (B_i \cup W_i) \cap W_{k-1}$. By applying the same argument repeatedly, we have $v \in W_j$ for all $i < j < k$. Otherwise, $v \in W_i \implies v \notin \bigcup_{j\geq i} B_j$ by KPW-2. Hence, $v \notin B_{k-1} \implies v \in W_{k-1}$. Applying the same argument repeatedly, we have $v \in W_j\ \forall i < j < k$.

- To show that DPW-3 holds true, i.e., $\forall\ (u, v) \in E(D)$, $\exists\ i, j$ such that $u \in X_i$ and $v \in X_j$, where $i \leq j$.

  By the observations from Section 6.1, it is sufficient to verify DGW-3, i.e., $\forall\ 1 \leq i \leq p$, $X_{i-1} \cap X_i$ guards $(\bigcup_{j\geq i} X_j) \setminus X_{i-1}$. From KPW-1, KPW-2, KPW-3 we get

  $$(\bigcup_{j\geq i} X_j) \setminus X_{i-1} = (\bigcup_{j\geq i} (B_j \cup W_j)) \setminus (B_{i-1} \cup W_{i-1})$$
  $$\Rightarrow (\bigcup_{j\geq i} X_j) \setminus X_{i-1} = (\bigcup_{j\geq i} B_j) \cup (W_i \setminus (B_{i-1} \cup W_{i-1}))$$
  $$\Rightarrow (\bigcup_{j\geq i} X_j) \setminus X_{i-1} = (\bigcup_{j\geq i} B_j)$$

  From KPW-1 and KPW-2 that $X_{i-1} \cap X_i = (B_{i-1} \cup W_{i-1}) \cap (B_i \cup W_i) = (B_{i-1} \cap B_i) \cup (B_{i-1} \cap W_i) \cup (W_{i-1} \cap B_i) \cup (W_{i-1} \cap W_i) =$
  $(B_{i-1} \cap W_i) \cup (W_{i-1} \cap W_i) = (B_{i-1} \cup W_{i-1}) \cap W_i = W_i$. Hence, it is sufficient to show that W_i guards $\bigcup_{j\geq i} B_j$, which is guaranteed by KPW-3.

Hence, $dpw(G) \leq kpw(G) - 1$. ☐

Corollary 6.5. *For a digraph G, a directed path decomposition of width k can be transformed to a Kelly-decomposition of width $k + 1$. In other words if $dpw(G) = k$, then $kw(G) \leq k + 1$.*

Proof. If G has directed pathwidth k, then by the previous lemma, G has Kelly pathwidth $k + 1$. Hence, $kw(G) \leq k + 1$. ☐

Corollary 6.6. *There exists a polynomial time algorithm that, given a digraph $G(V, E)$ with $|V| = n$, finds a Kelly-decomposition $\mathcal{K} = (D, (B_t)_{t\in V(D)}, (W_t)_{t\in V(D)})$ of G of width at most $O(k \cdot \log^{\frac{3}{2}} n)$, where k is the Kelly-width of G.*

Proof. In Section 5, we presented an algorithm that finds an approximate path decomposition (say $\mathcal{P}$) of G. Using Lemma 6.4, $\mathcal{P}$ can be converted to a corresponding Kelly decomposition $\mathcal{K} = (D, (B_t)_{t \in V(D)}, (W_t)_{t \in V(D)})$ such that $width(\mathcal{K}) = width(\mathcal{P}) + 1$ and the DAG D is a directed path. The approximation factor follows from the discussion at the end of Section 2.6. ☐

7 Open Problems

We presented the first approximation algorithms for directed treewidth, D-width, DAG-width, Kelly-width and directed pathwidth. Our algorithms for DAG-width and Kelly-width are implied by our construction of approximate directed path decomposition. This resulted in an approximation factor of $O(\log^{\frac{3}{2}} n)$ for DAG-width and Kelly-width. A better way of approximating them is to construct the DAG-decompositions and Kelly-decompositions directly (similar to our algorithms for directed treewidth and D-width). However, it is not clear how to directly construct these decompositions and achieve better approximation factors. This is perhaps the most interesting open problem arising from our work.

Acknowledgements : We gratefully acknowledge helpful discussions with Robin Thomas. He motivated us to look at Theorem 3.3 from [JRST01] which helped us in designing our approximation algorithm for directed tree width (see Section 3). He also encouraged us to construct approximate directed path decompositions. We would like to thank Yury Makarychev for answering our questions about directed separators.

References

[ACMM05] Amit Agarwal, Moses Charikar, Konstantin Makarychev, and Yury Makarychev. O($\sqrt{\log n}$) approximation algorithms for min uncut, min 2cnf deletion, and directed cut problems. In *STOC*, pages 573–581, 2005. 2, 5

[BDH$^+$09] Dietmar Berwanger, Anuj Dawar, Paul Hunter, Stephan Kreutzer, and Jan Obdrzálek. The dag-width of directed graphs. 2009. 4, 6, 11

[BDHK06] Dietmar Berwanger, Anuj Dawar, Paul Hunter, and Stephan Kreutzer. Dag-width and parity games. In *STACS*, pages 524–536, 2006. 2, 4

[BGHK95] Hans L. Bodlaender, John R. Gilbert, Hjálmtyr Hafsteinsson, and Ton Kloks. Approximating treewidth, pathwidth, frontsize, and shortest elimination tree. *J. Algorithms*, 18(2):238–255, 1995. 2, 5

[HK08] Paul Hunter and Stephan Kreutzer. Digraph measures: Kelly decompositions, games, and orderings. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 399(3):206–219, 2008. 2, 4, 6

[JRST01] Thor Johnson, Neil Robertson, Paul D. Seymour, and Robin Thomas. Directed tree-width. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B*, 82(1):138–154, 2001. 2, 3, 6, 14

[LR99] Frank Thomson Leighton and Satish Rao. Multicommodity max-flow min-cut theorems and their use in designing approximation algorithms. *J. ACM*, 46(6):787–832, 1999. 2, 5

[Obd06] Jan Obdrzálek. Dag-width: connectivity measure for directed graphs. In *SODA*, pages 814–821, 2006. 2, 4

[RS86] Neil Robertson and Paul D. Seymour. Graph minors. ii. algorithmic aspects of tree-width. *J. Algorithms*, 7(3):309–322, 1986. 1

[Saf05] Mohammad Ali Safari. D-width: A more natural measure for directed tree width. In *MFCS*, pages 745–756, 2005. 2, 3